

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**LAUREL HILL ADAPTIVE REUSE CITIZEN TASK FORCE MEETING**  
**January 20, 2004 / 7:00 PM**

**Task Force Members Present:** Tim Sargeant (Chair), Robert W. Cosgriff (Vice-Chair), Albert B. Akers, Neal McBride, Penny Wilkinson, Jennifer Heinz, Irma Clifton, Beverly Cosham, Ellice Ammana, Liz Bradsher

**Task Force Members Absent:** Douglas M. Wren, Dave Patten, Brian Scott Tishuk, Sheila Coates

**Department of Planning and Zoning:** Marianne Gardner, Lindsay Mason

**EDAW:** Paul Moyer

**I. Review of January 17<sup>th</sup> task force planning workshop**

Tim Sargeant called the meeting to order. Paul Moyer distributed a revised Scenario Evaluation Matrix and a summary of the comments Task Force members made at the workshop. The task force reviewed the handouts and made suggestions for corrections and clarifications.

Tim Sargeant asked staff to consult Jaak Pedak from the Department of Transportation to get his opinion on constructing an additional entry point form Silverbrook Road.

Paul Moyer will research options and alternatives for public ownership.

Irma Clifton indicated she would like a clearer explanation of the definitions of targeted and workforce housing, and how they are different from ADUs. Ellice Amanna said she would look into the definitions between the terms.

**II. Next Steps – Recommendations**

Tim Sargeant suggested that an Oversight Commission should be appointed as the redevelopment process proceeds. This Commission should involve County staff and citizens, and a professional developer acting as liaison. The professional developer would be a neutral party with professional expertise who would help the Commission understand the process and issues involved. The Commission would participate in public meetings, discussions with the GSA, and the renegotiation of the MOA, review potential tenants/inhabitants, and generally oversee the implementation of the recommendations.

Neal McBride: North Adams, Massachusetts, had a similar group. Does the Economic Development Authority have a similar group?

Paul Moyer will research examples of how this has been done in other situations.

**III. Schedule of Public meetings and briefings**

Jennifer Heinz expressed concern that the meeting with the South County Federation (SCF) scheduled for February 10<sup>th</sup> may be too soon to prepare a presentation on the recommendations. The task force would not be able to preview what EDAW puts together before the meeting. Tina Pettis,

President of the SCF, said she could tell her membership to go to the public meeting on February 21<sup>st</sup> instead. Another meeting with the SCF will be scheduled for March 9<sup>th</sup>.

On February 4<sup>th</sup>, the task force will vote on a preliminary concept and recommendations. EDAW will show a draft presentation to the task force on February 11<sup>th</sup>. The final vote will occur after public input has been received and necessary revisions are made. On March 18<sup>th</sup>, the task force will have a final discussion of recommendations. On March 25<sup>th</sup>, the task force will finalize its recommendations.

Ellice Amanna: Citizens should know that this task force process is not the final step, and that the Board of Supervisors has the final say, complete with the requisite public hearings.

Ellice expressed concern that both of the public input meetings are being held in the Laurel Hill area, rather than in a more central location. In response, the scheduled Task Force meeting on March 4<sup>th</sup> at the Government Center was changed to a public input meeting. The two original meetings will still be held in South County.

Staff should process the public input received as quickly as possible so that the task force members can review the material and be prepared to make a decision.

Irma asked about the process for voicing concerns or proposing alternatives. Tim indicated that although consensus among all task force members would be ideal, dissenting opinions can be included if necessary. At this time, the task force is forwarding preliminary recommendations to the public.

Irma stated she was concerned that Scenario 2 does not use and preserve the site in the way seen in the Comprehensive Plan and the MOA. The first Laurel Hill Task Force recommended residential, the second task force had to take it out, and now residential is again back on the table. It was a fight all the way through the process to get the buildings protected, and Irma does not want that to be compromised by the new recommendations. She will put her concerns in writing to share with the members at the next meeting.

Ellice pointed out that the task force is recommending a concept only, and not plans for specific buildings or designs. The Request For Proposals (RFP) process will decide what specific things will be developed and what buildings will be changed or redeveloped. Ellice explained that the realities the costs have swayed her toward the more financially viable options. Housing has been a major focus of debate in the past, so the task force will need to be prepared and listening for these issues at the public input meetings.

Tim concurred that finding a scenario that will pay for the adaptive reuse of the buildings is important.

Jennifer Heinz pointed out that preservation may be more effective if something is done sooner rather than later.

The meeting was adjourned.

***The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, February 4, 2004, Conference Rooms 4/5 at the Fairfax County Government Center.***